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CHAIR BELL: Hello, everyone.
Happy New Year to you. Nice to see everyone.
All right.

This is the meeting of the Facilities Committee of the Board of Trustees.
Today is Tuesday, January 7th, 2014 and I ask Beverly to call roll to make sure we have a quorum.

MS. FRANKLIN: Mr. Bell?
CHAIR BELL: Present.

MS. FRANKLIN: Mr. Felton?
TRUSTEE FELTON: Present.

MS. FRANKLIN: Mr. Shelton?
TRUSTEE SHELTON: Present.

MS. FRANKLIN: Mr. Askew? Dr. Curry?

TRUSTEE CURRY: Present.

MS. FRANKLIN: Dr. Lyons?

PRESIDENT LYONS: Present.

MS. FRANKLIN: Mr. Chair, you do
have a quorum.

CHAIR BELL: Okay. Thank you very much.

Ladies and gentlemen, we are going to move the agenda around just a little bit. We're going to go ahead and do the approval of the minutes and then what we'll do is we'll move the Motor Coach Bus contract discussion be after the Facilities construction planning and other business remarks because one of our Trustees who is en route would like to make sure that he'd be here to participate in that.

So, what I'd like to do now is turn to the approval of the minutes. The minutes were provided to you in your folder. Hopefully, everyone's had a chance to peruse those.

TRUSTEE SHELTON: Motion to accept, Mr. Chair.

TRUSTEE FELTON: Second.

CHAIR BELL: Motion has been made and seconded to accept the minutes.
Any objections? All those in favor?

(Ayes.)

CHAIR BELL: Seeing no objections, the motion carries unanimously.

Okay. So, those minutes will be approved.

I'd now like to go to item four on the agenda Facility Construction Planning if that's okay with you, Barbara, for --

MS. JUMPER: Um-hum.

CHAIR BELL: -- a report from you on that.

MS. JUMPER: Okay. So, good afternoon. Happy New Year to all.

The purpose of putting this on the agenda today was to basically seek some -- or give you an update of where we believe we are as relates to some of the items primarily that were addressed in the Strategic Plan document. Our understanding based on the last meeting that actually voted on the
Strategic Plan in some part basically gave the Vice President for Facilities and Real Estate Office the authority to proceed with campus housing. At least, that was my understanding after asking for another interpretation of that.

With that said, our next step in the sequence of moving this forward would be to move forward with initiating a solicitation for a public/private partnership. This would be necessary to determine who would actually be working with the University to provide funding, to negotiate with the City in terms of its use of our land, to determine how we would seek financing should we move forward.

I wanted to take this opportunity to make sure that I have the best understanding of where we are with this issue and the reason being is this would, in fact, net or yield some cost to the University to move forward and it is not a small amount of money.
CHAIR BELL: Okay.

MS. JUMPER: So, we need to be very clear that we understand as it relates to campus housing how we should proceed.

Based on what I heard, and I would appreciate correction, from the last meeting is that we already had approval to move forward with the campus housing and should keep doing what we're doing.

So, we're operating under the understanding that with the master plan approval that was the understanding from the Board that that was authority to keep doing what we were doing and we are moving in that direction.

But, obviously, to move forward with a solicitation would be actually publicly notifying interested parties of our interest to move forward with campus housing on our property.

It would also be probably not working in good faith if we moved forward
without understanding very clearly that the Board is supporting us moving forward in that direction.

CHAIR BELL: Okay.

MS. JUMPER: So, that's what -- I would like to put that on the table for discussion.

CHAIR BELL: Trustee.

TRUSTEE FELTON: Yes, I guess what I would like as part of this dialogue is I'm not yet clear on -- I mean I agree with you. There needs to be a little clarity here because supporting our position is one thing. Making a financial commitment is another and can you talk about the relationship between moving forward and what does that actually mean in terms of potential financial commitment?

MS. JUMPER: Yes, so, thank you for that question.

There's a host of concerns that we need to address.
One, as you may recall, we have a requirement to go back to the State Department as it relates to where housing would be positioned and to discuss the actual design of housing to insure that they are actually comfortable with what we're presenting.

We do not have a design to date. We have given schematics and we presented that to the Board several months ago, but the next step is actually entering into a contract with the developer to actually architecturally design what the housing complex will look like and it is a cost that the University will incur.

So, that's a major issue. Also, the next step obviously would be to have dialogue with the City stakeholders. Primarily, the Chief Financial Officer to bring out partner to the table to say how, in fact, we will work the financial workings of a deal for land use and any other nuances that they would need to have satisfied to give us
the blessing and move forward with financing.

So, those are the elements that
right now -- before we move in that direction,
I think it would not be wise to have those
discussions with City stakeholders. For
example, should we not have the full blessing
of the Board.

Understanding that you do not have
to sufficient information now to say, in fact,
you bless the financial scheme because we
don't know what that is yet.

But, conceptually, do you bless us
moving forward? I think that's kind of the
issue at the table.

CHAIR BELL: So, I'll try to take
a stab at it because I guess there has been
some confusion.

I think what the Trustees were
saying when we were doing the Strategic Plan
was that there was not a need per se to
reference the housing in the plan in the way
that it was being mentioned because we support
the housing.

The concept of the housing on the campus, and by all means, Trustees, please step -- feel free to step in, the concept has been approved in our master plan. So, the idea of housing on the University is not something that the Trustees object to. We, in fact, support that.

We've gotten approval for it. We're the only University that has such approval for such housing. I mean for a master plan like that in D.C.

I think where the concern was was are the factors there to justify the housing at this time and several Trustees had expressed concern about seeing a growth in student population. Because until we see a stabilization, if you will, in increases in the student population both at the community college and at the flagship, there was real concern about moving forward with concrete steps or incurring costs to bring about that.
housing.

So, as a threshold matter, I believe all the Trustees are supportive of housing. It's just a question of when the market dynamics will and the student population dynamics will obtain such that we will be able to do the housing for the campus.

So, do you guys have a different view?

TRUSTEE SHELTON: Not really.

CHAIR BELL: Okay.

TRUSTEE SHELTON: It's -- oh, I'm sorry.

CHAIR BELL: Trustee Shelton.

TRUSTEE SHELTON: My thoughts were that because we were ambiguous that you needed to prepare as much information about the process and procedure so that at such a time as we can move forward, we would have the full range of costs and expenses.

By saying no, it's stops you completely. But, by saying you have enough
authority to go forward, it's just like you're bringing us a piece of it. Really, it's a whole package and the whole package you're telling me that it's going to cost us to work with the developer.

How much is -- what are we talking about? How much of our budget are we attacking?

Those are the reasons why I was supportive of not closing the door. I wanted to see the whole package. How much the projected cost would be. Your best guess. Not what it's going to be for real, but your best professional guess as a total cost to initiate this project. The different phases of the project. So, that we could begin to look at it in a realistic term and then we could decide whether or not we're prepared to go now and if we decide to go at a later time, we will have foundation information to make a better informed decision. But, we needed data.
Just saying that we want to have it and a survey that we did to see about the current situation is still not enough to jump fully into it, but if we say no, it stops the consideration and that's what I was arguing against. Is stopping the consideration until we got a solid plan of what was going to happen if and when we did housing.

The display of the models that were demonstrated was fine, but I didn't see any dollar signs. I don't recall any dollar signs. Let me say it that way because I know your team does it job. Okay.

CHAIR BELL: And if I could just jump in on that because I may not have made it clear. I understand that you have to spend money in order to help realize this. So, it's not that there can't be any cost incurred.

Let the record reflect that Trustee Askew has come into the room.

Happy New Year, Trustee Askew.

So, we understand that cost will
have to be incurred in order to help realize
the vision and to lay the framework. So, in
that respect, I'm in full agreement with what
Trustee Shelton has said.

Just the narrow part with respect
to the Strategic Plan, I think that there was
a sense that it was too much information in
there about the housing because as a concept
we supported the housing, but in the plan, it
talked about whether we would do HBCU fund,
whether we'd go to Department of Education or
what have you and we didn't feel that all of
that needed to be in there.

We still said that housing should
be in there, but it was to include it from the
perspective that when the conditions are
right, we would do it as opposed to kind of
talking about the nuts and bolts of housing
and how it was financed because we didn't
think that necessarily that needed to be in
the plan.

But, I don't want you to think
that there's any disagreement among the Board
about housing. What the disagreement is I
think or what the concern is is making sure
that we've got the student population there
that will help the housing.

But, doing the studies, getting
the support, talking about where it would be
satisfying requirements to the housing, I
think that's all part and parcel of getting to
that point for the housing.

Trustee Felton.

TRUSTEE FELTON: Yes, I actually
-- I'm not sure if I participated in the
discussion during the retreat, but I thought
there were some discussions we had about
what's really going to drive this are the
financial package options that are available.

So, to me, it was just as important to say
yes, sure we're interested in housing, but,
you know, what's the likelihood of the kind of
financial packages that we need to be
concerned with because we're not -- it's not
like just go buy another building.

I thought we were looking at --

and I can't, sorry, remember the name of what
you call this thing, but it's -- you know, we
have the lay-in and we work a deal with the
private sector and they build it and you have
a X number of year lease and I mean so we're
looking for like what are some of the ways
that we could do this that would be -- have at
least a financial impact and I think the more
of that kind of information the more
comfortable a Board Member feels as opposed to
saying well, let's go for it regardless of
whatever it costs.

CHAIR BELL: I think also --

TRUSTEE FELTON: That was my

recolletion.

CHAIR BELL: Right and it had been
pointed out that it was -- it should be
revenue neutral because --

TRUSTEE FELTON: Yes.

CHAIR BELL: -- we had pointed out
that University housing theoretically pays for itself from the students that are required to live there either as freshmen or sophomore or what have you.

So, that those were the factors that we would consider as well, but where would the students come from? You know, how would they pay for it? Those were some of the -- there was a lot of threshold issues that we were looking at.

But, I don't think anyone on the Board is against student housing. I'm not aware of any --

MS. JUMPER: I hope it's very clear that I didn't suggest that.

CHAIR BELL: Okay.

MS. JUMPER: What I'm asking is understanding that the Board to move this forward would be basically blessing an investment that may not be a minor investment, to actually go to the next step, to provide you that level of detail.
I do want to recall or remind. I want to be very careful how I choose my words. State that we have done a preliminary pro forma of what it would involve and we have had the opportunity to share that. It is cost neutral. It is, however, without the next step of knowing what that financial scheme would be.

But, what has been presented today has spoken to a cost neutral. In fact, a revenue generating opportunity if we were to look into 307 beds. That's what this document speaks to. Which I won't -- unless you want a copy of it. But, it did speak to covering all of our cost and, in fact, being an upside position of basically earning revenue.

The next step, however, the reason I'm raising this is I just want to be clear as we move forward that from what I heard at the last meeting that we have the blessing of the Board to move forward with now a formal solicitation to look into the next step which
will be a partnership.

We've not and never have presented a scenario where the University would incur the cost. That we would actually enter into a development relationship. The developer, in fact, would most likely take on the burden financially, but working through the University and the City, the City would have to bless this scenario because we don't have the ability to do our own financing. The City would have to bless that.

So, we're -- basically, before we go in that direction, it's imperative that we understand that the Board is comfortable with us moving because this now, one, exposes us publicly with a formal solicitation and we want to make sure that we're doing it in good faith and that it's not done just to -- for an exercise. That is it -- so, that's a concern I had.

CHAIR BELL: Okay.

MS. JUMPER: Okay.
CHAIR BELL: And it's hard to say

-- I'm sorry. Trustee Askew, do you want to
go?

TRUSTEE ASKEW: Well, so, we're

having a conversation about whether or not
it's okay to go ahead with a formal
solicitation. Is that correct?

MS. JUMPER: I was seeking
clarification of what I heard from the last
Board meeting as it relates to campus housing
and what we perceive as the next step to be is
a solicitation and --

TRUSTEE ASKEW: Right.

MS. JUMPER: -- whether or not if
we moved in that direction would that be
viewed as in opposition of what the Board's
thinking as of right now.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: Oh, so, there's a
question there.

MS. JUMPER: It's a question.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: Okay. Right. So,
it's a discussion. Right. Right. Right.
About it.

PRESIDENT LYONS: And, Mr. Chairman, we want to be sure that as we make these next steps that, you know, the Board is beyond those steps.

I mean the solicitation is one, but if we're going to sit down with the State Department and go through that discussion with them and talk about whether the facility needs to be moved further to the east or further to the west and really get into that, going down talking to the folks in the Wilson Building, we don't want there to be any misunderstanding about why we're doing and moving in that direction.

And we at least want to be sure that we have the blessing of the Board to continue moving forward. Because if we don't, then there's no need to go through all of that scheduling meetings with the State Department and invoking the D.C. Government and doing the solicitation.
So, we're just trying -- because we were not certain when we left. We all have been hanging on that quote of keep on doing what you're doing. I won't say who mentioned that. Said that, but since the meeting, I mean we all -- and when we got back here we found out that everybody had a different definition and understanding of keep on doing what you're doing, you know.

So, that's why we wanted to come back and get some clarification.

CHAIR BELL: It's a difficult question and I see why you guys are having some confusion about this. I mean I will say again I think the Board of Trustees supports housing.

What I don't know if there's uniformity about is the time frame for that housing.

So, you could go in and do your feasibility studies. You can engage in an RFP with a developer, but I don't know if when
that's all done if the circumstances on the ground will align such that the Board would get to the point where they would say yes.

So, I do think you need to -- because of enrollment. I think that's the big factor.

So, I do think that you have to do those basic steps, but what I can't tell you is that, you know, after there's an RFP for a developer and a developer comes in and they do their work, then once they're done they say okay, we're ready and if the enrollment is still stagnant or if it's still the same, I don't think that you're going to find support among the Board to do the housing at that time. It doesn't mean that they don't support housing, but they don't think that the factors align.

So, yes, you should do housing. I actually -- I'm not even sure that I even view this as something that needs to come to the Facilities Committee at this point because
we've said that we're committed to housing.

   I view this as an operational

issue. This is what you do to run your

business. You do studies. You do

feasibility. You review. You get the facts

together on the ground.

   If your RFP that you want to

engage in with your developer is over X amount

of dollars, well, then obviously, the Board is

going to have to approve it. But, I mean this

is a day-to-day business operation that

involves long-term planning for housing on the

University and what I'm reluctant to say is

that by hiring this developer once that

developer is done, everything will align for

the housing.

   Yes, I don't know that it will. I

don't know that it will be there three years

or five years. Maybe it will be. I don't

know.

   But, if you hire that developer

and they do their work and come up with the
architectural plans and we've satisfied the
State Department, but, in fact, the enrollment
is exactly the same or if it's even less, I
don't think housing's going to go anywhere at
that time. That would just be my thinking.

Because I think we'd want to see
that there is evidence that it could be
sustained, the housing and that there's a
population for that housing. I could be
wrong. I don't know, but I feel like you're
asking, you know, once we go down this road,
you know, that you're --

MS. JUMPER: No, I'm not asking
that, Trustee Bell.

CHAIR BELL: Okay. Okay.

MS. JUMPER: I'm not.

CHAIR BELL: Okay. So -- okay.

MS. JUMPER: My question is the
next sequence of events based on what has been
done to date because we've spent a sizable
amount of money. We've spent a lot of time on
this issue and from what I heard in the last
Board meeting, it suggested that we could proceed as we have been.

But, yet, there's always been --

the question is the next step should logically be a solicitation. The solicitation will likely be some cost to incur. I can't tell you and I don't know if my team can tell me at this point what that will entail.

I also now that the next logical step beyond that is to engage stakeholders from the City.

My concern is to have that level of detailed discussion without some affirmation for that specific dialogue from the Board and I think that's a reasonable question that I think would be helpful as we move forward.

Not to say that we're looking for a firm commitment. Because clearly, the outcome will dictate how we move forward.

Clearly, the enrollment will be determined and possibly could be an element for attracting
students if we could say we're moving in that
direction.

So, I'm not looking for that level
of, you know, finality. I'm looking at an
affirmation to proceed and I think I'm hearing
you say we can.

But, it would be helpful to me,
just so there's no ambiguity as we move
forward, to know that that's how the Board is
seeing us moving forward in a still
exploratory mode. But, there is potentially
cost to be incurred and a broader audience to
be engaged with the City's involvement. So,
that's really the issue.

You with me?

CHAIR BELL: I'm with you. I'm
with you.

TRUSTEE FELTON: I was going to
say, you know, it seems to me and maybe not,
but it seems to me what the -- what they're
asking for is sort of a little more specifics
about what moving forward means. So, that it
saying yes, reaffirm our support for housing. We believe that we should do X which might mean solicitations. We believe there should be discussions with stakeholders.

I mean it seems to me it has to be a little more than the one sentence because I could see that the concern would be as soon as somebody who, you know, outside of these walls, disagrees, you know, are we going to then say oh, well, let's reconsider. Because it wasn't clear that you could take four steps. It was only clear that you could take one step and I think that's a hard way to do business.

So, either we have to be very clear about how far she can go or it seems to me it's not worth taking that first step.

TRUSTEE SHELTON: How far are we to go?

MS. JUMPER: I mean I've laid out the way I see it. Perhaps there's a different opinion of the Board.
TRUSTEE SHELTON: My question is more to you tell me what you need from us other than -- right now, I hear -- I think I hear a vote from the Board with a definitive statement about how. Is that what I'm hearing? Correct?

TRUSTEE FELTON: But, no specifics.

TRUSTEE SHELTON: But, with no specifics.

TRUSTEE FELTON: But, we need -- she's saying I need more specifics than that.

CHAIR BELL: Yes, we're kind of getting into a chicken and an egg problem I think.

Okay. So, let me ask Trustee Askew because he wanted to jump in.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: Yes, so, the first thing for me is because we have been building on what I believed has been a housing plan and we just added a couple of rooms. So, we've expanded. So, we haven't been stagnant in my
view. So, we've been building on this.

We're also as a part of that gathering data. Right? The demand and all this other kind of stuff.

For me, I'm cautious about moving too fast or too aggressively. Because when you say the cost of the solicitation and again, we don't know that today. So, how could we make a decision on whether solicitation is the way to go because we don't know what the financial cost is.

The solicitation because we don't -- we're not clear on what that plan is. I'm not sure today at least on what would be included in the solicitation. Are we going or is the solicitation to build 200 rooms, then 300 rooms? I don't know that.

TRUSTEE FELTON: The scope.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: What's the scope?

I don't know that.

MS. JUMPER: The scope is the same as it has always been. It was based on the
original approval from the master plan of 600 beds in phases of 200 beds per. So, there would be three buildings. Based on the model that was shown to the Board, it was three different buildings each having 200 beds per. So, it would gradually come on board as we have demand and that's what was the original plan.

I mean we -- yes.

TRUSTEE SHELTON: Didn't we approve that?

MS. JUMPER: No, sir, we did not.

TRUSTEE SHELTON: At no point did we approve -- I'm sorry.

MS. JUMPER: It was never approved.

TRUSTEE SHELTON: At no point did we approve the model that --

MS. JUMPER: I don't recall any approval. I will say we didn't ask for an approval. I think it got to a point --

TRUSTEE SHELTON: You just made
the presentation.

MS. JUMPER: The presentation was made and it kind of got off into some other issues. So, we didn't get to a real discussion on that.

But, that was not the final design. The reality is at some point --

TRUSTEE SHELTON: Those are just schematics. Yes.

MS. JUMPER: -- we came out to get the State Department's. I didn't really intend to spend all day on this discussion, but it is a valid and it's a real necessary discussion for me and my team in terms of how to proceed.

The State Department we can't, you know, forget that there's a very serious element there that needs to see something in order to say, in fact, we bless it being on our campus because they have that -- or they believe at this point they have that authority and we have made a commitment to give them a
design to look at.

So, we are at a place where I don't have a design to give them. I can show them the schematic, but that doesn't give them the comfort that it does address the security concerns.

So, the bottom line is how do you as the Facilities Committee see us proceeding based on the most recent vote as it relates to housing to answer the issues for the State Department and the community?

In a couple of days, we have a meeting with them. They're going to ask questions about housing.

So, just help me navigate that so we will know how to move forward in answering those questions.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: So, for me, you know, again, I mean I -- and I think that there's so many different moving pieces to this in making this decision, you know. So, now, that, you know, we have an understanding
of the scope, for me, I guess the question just becomes -- you know, because if there's finances involved I mean again, you know, we got to look at the timing of this and other things that we're doing and again, I guess whatever the cost of the solicitation will be.

You know, even though I think the State Department and the community are things that I think we could care for, they're not mandating that we do something right now that would cost us -- that makes us want to -- we have to run out and just throw out some money to do something that we're not financially in a position to do.

And so, again, everybody supports student housing. I support doing it, but I support doing it in a way that we have some level of comfort that we're not having to take two more steps back because we continue to take -- you know, we do something and then all of a sudden we got to take two or three more steps back to deal with the issue.
The student housing will get built. The builder will build it. He'll finance it.

But, at the end of the day, we're going to be left on the hook for filling those rooms and that really does have to go to enrollment and right now, we don't know what enrollment is. We know that the law school -- I mean I'm getting -- and it's not anywhere near what was projected last year, the year before that and it's a small portion.

But, there are some certainties. I think there's a little bit more comfort in what those numbers are going to look like based upon what's happening nationally.

So, I'm in full support of student housing, but I'm -- you know, it's just the timing and making sure that we are in a situation that if we do this, you know, we're not looking at ourselves, you know, two/three years down the road saying oh, wow, why did we do this? We got this building. It's built.
It looks great, but we can't get, you know, 200/300 students in it to pay market-rate rent.

All right and particularly when 80 percent of your student base, you know, is from the District of Columbia and some of which will have other options, you know, besides market-rate rent.

So, and again, those are at least my concerns.

CHAIR BELL: Did you want to say something?

PRESIDENT LYONS: Not yet.

CHAIR BELL: Not yet. Okay.

PRESIDENT LYONS: You saw the wheels turning?

CHAIR BELL: Yes.

PRESIDENT LYONS: Well, I will say something. You know, I guess, you know, we've been talking about this ever since I've been here and at some point, we've got to move and I don't mean that in a frivolous or less than
serious manner, but I mean how long are we
-going to talk about this and I'm not sure
we're any further along today than we were
when I arrived. Well, yes, we are because we
had a demonstration and we've seen a model and
so forth.

But, at what point -- I guess, you
know, we want to bring some things to closure.
I mean I'm getting ready to ask you about 801,
you know, I mean and this is the easy one
right here. You know, start talking about
801.

I mean I -- but, I mean, you know,
how do we move? We got to be concerned about
the numbers and I'm hearing and I'm
understanding at least more now because of the
enrollment, how the enrollment and we talked
about that in our meeting this morning. The
importance of enrollment.

So, the fact that our enrollment
-- overall enrollment is not moving up gives
you some concern about whether we'll fill the
beds. I mean that's legitimate. I mean that makes sense and it helps us understand.

But, there are some things if we're going to make this happen we need to move. There are some people we need to talk to and do some things.

Like I said, we did not want you to pick up the paper and hear we've met with the folks from the State Department and having these conversations and have someone come back and say wait a minute. You know, why are you all over there talking to the State Department. Getting them upset. We never did such and such.

So, we need to move ahead. I think this is a great project.

You know, 200 beds, I guess I don't see that as a problem. I guess I'm thinking about the 600 and how we bring the second two buildings on line, but the first building with the 200 beds, I guess to me that doesn't -- I don't see that as a major issue.
The question that I have, you know, as we talked to bring in a partner, et cetera, you know, is how can we phase this in a way that doesn't commit us to 600 beds if we've only got enough to fill 400 beds, you know.

So, but those are things that you discuss with the partners when they come in and put paper to pencil and that's going to cost. I mean you don't know right now what the cost will be, but I don't how we can avoid that and move forward the project. I mean I think we're there, you know, and that has to be the next step.

No one is rushing us to do this, but people are asking us questions. You know, how long are you going to talk about it?

We're talking to students. I think that the absence of housing and some may disagree with that. I think that the option of actually having on-campus housing may take care of one or two of the pieces of this
element. I mean because we do -- it's anecdotal and I know that some were not convinced that the surveys we did for the previous presentation -- old water. I'm not -- you know, some of you all thought they were kind of shaky to be truthful, but, you know, I think just anecdotally we know.

I got three new students right now I met on the red line, you know, who are at Virginia State and would have been here by their own testimony had we had housing. Well, we can't market that.

But, I asked them sitting on the Metro why are you all carrying book bags from Virginia State? We wanted to stay close to home, but we wanted to be in a residential environment. So, we didn't even apply to UDC. They applied to Trinity, Howard and Virginia State. You know, so, you know --

CHAIR BELL: I think we need to have more discussion because, you know, I don't see any contraction between what you and
Joseph said, you know, and so --

PRESIDENT LYONS: And I wasn't implying that.

CHAIR BELL: No. No, but -- no.

No, but I mean you're just saying but how long are we going to keep talking about this. We need to move and what I heard Joseph saying was we want to move, but we're just -- we're leery of the expenses.

So, in my mind, you go out and you get the studies. I mean I understand that it's going to cost dollars in order to do this. I don't think the Board ever said that you can't spend money to do this. I mean this is part of the operations. This is what you do as facilities and as part of your work, you're going out. You're doing studies. You're reviewing. Stuff like that.

But, if at the end of those studies, what I'm concerned about is that people think well, okay, now that these studies are all done, we're ready to go and
I'm just saying I'm not sure that at the end of those studies we will be ready to go. We may be, but I'm not sure that we will.

So, I mean I think that you should go out and get an RFP and seek developers and designers to come on. I have no problem with that. I think that that's important stuff to do.

But, while that's going on, hopefully, enrollment is going up and other things are being addressed. Because what I'd hate to see is that headline that says the University is continuing to slip in enrollment, is losing program certification and now wants to build 200 dorms. You know, it's a difficult thing to reconcile when we're got all these competing tangents. But, I absolutely -- tangents.

But, I absolutely think that we should be moving forward progressing with housing and I don't think anyone has said that you shouldn't. I guess you're just -- your
concern is about just how committed we are?

MS. JUMPER: No. No. I want to

be very, very clear of what I've put on the

table and want to -- definitely not suggested

that you are saying that anything other than

-- I'm seeking clarification of how to

proceed. It's pure and simple as that.

CHAIR BELL: But, what do you need

the Board to tell you to proceed? Because --

MS. JUMPER: Because we have to go

to parties outside of the University.

CHAIR BELL: Right.

MS. JUMPER: Now having concrete

discussions with stakeholders in the District

and --

CHAIR BELL: Right.

MS. JUMPER: -- Joe, you know very

well that means a lot now. That's a different

issue. When you start having discussions, it

means it's more -- it's very close to being

real.

CHAIR BELL: Right.
MS. JUMPER: Okay. So, we don't have those discussions --

CHAIR BELL: Yes, but you go to the State Department and you talk to the City. We'd like to have housing ideally in three to five years. This is what I think we're going to need. We want to get a developer. This is what we're looking at. I have no problem with any of that.

I think that you can do that.

MS. JUMPER: Okay.

CHAIR BELL: But, if you're going to the State Department and saying we're going to have housing by 2017, that might be a check that we can't cash because we don't know what the enrollment's going to look like.

But, I have no problem with you right now going to the State Department. We have a master plan that's been approved that says we're going to put housing. This is the location of the housing. This is what we're thinking about the housing. This is what we
I want to do. We've got a developer here that's got these schematics for us to look at.

I don't think anybody would object to that because that's not obligating the University in a way that, you know, if the facts on the ground don't align that we can't do it.

So, I think you can talk to the City. I think you can talk to the State Department. I think you can do your RFP. That's part of doing facilities for the University.

But, if, you know, six months from now, you were come up, and I know you wouldn't, but six months, you're going to say okay, we've got a proposal to build 200 units. Board we need your approval. You said you were on board. I'm going to be like no, that's not what we were on line with unless that we know that the enrollment and other factors were there to help support that. So, that you have to do the due diligence to get
there.

So, I mean are we talking over each other or no?

MS. JUMPER: I'm just clarification, Trustee.

CHAIR BELL: But, I'm trying to clarify. Is it that --

MS. JUMPER: I think I've heard that you want us to proceed. So, I think we're clear that you're saying proceed and --

TRUSTEE SHELTON: Formal discussion at this level should be sufficient to go. This is the Committee that would make the terminal recommendation. So, the Committee is --

MS. JUMPER: That's all I'm seeking.

TRUSTEE SHELTON: -- clearly -- and by its not saying something formally, gives you your professional authority to go forward I thought.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: That's a --
MS. JUMPER: I don't know about --

CHAIR BELL: But, I mean to your point, Barbara, I would not be concerned if a week from now I read -- even if we didn't have this discussion, if I read UDC officials are talking with the State Department about housing in the future. That doesn't concern me.

If you went out and said UDC official talks with, you know, $10 million investment for housing that's going to happen on -- I'd be like, Barbara, you really shouldn't have said that.

But, you can go and talk about housing with the State Department or with the City Council and feasibility of the study. That's what you're suppose to do.

TRUSTEE FELTON: But, my concern, you know, is that we cannot control what is said about the meetings.

CHAIR BELL: Right.

TRUSTEE FELTON: We know what our
intent is.

CHAIR BELL: Right.

TRUSTEE FELTON: We know what our intent is --

CHAIR BELL: Right.

TRUSTEE FELTON: -- by going into the meetings.

CHAIR BELL: Sure.

TRUSTEE FELTON: But, if from the meeting, they interpret or misinterpret that, you know, UDC Board is ready to commit to a 600-bed residential, you know, living, what does that mean?

I mean maybe what we should say is exactly what your restriction is.

CHAIR BELL: Well, but, I mean we can't control what people are interpreting.

TRUSTEE FELTON: No. No. No, but I'm saying you can say --

CHAIR BELL: I mean no matter what --

TRUSTEE FELTON: -- that where we
are committed --

TRUSTEE SHELTON: Following

through with the Master Plan. Which we've

already approved our Master Plan. Which was

to include housing on campus.

TRUSTEE FELTON: When?

TRUSTEE SHELTON: This plan is

approved. Isn't that the Master Plan?

MS. JUMPER: The Master Plan was

approved by Zoning Administrator, Zoning Board

two years ago. It's the ten-year plan.

TRUSTEE SHELTON: It's a ten-year

plan.

MS. JUMPER: So, we're now years

into it.

TRUSTEE SHELTON: And following

that ten-year plan --

CHAIR BELL: The first step is we

want to talk to you about this.

TRUSTEE SHELTON: And we're still

inside our approval period. After ten years,

you might need some additional authority.
But, again, that's my thought.

MS. JUMPER: I appreciate clarification because that has not always been my understanding how we were going to proceed with this. So, that's why I'm seeking that.

TRUSTEE SHELTON: Again, discussion in the minutes gives you, you know, supportive documentation if you will -- I'm sorry. The minutes of our discussion -- okay.

CHAIR BELL: Go ahead, Trustee.

TRUSTEE SHELTON: No, again, that's where I am. What can we do to give her the assurance short of the Board of Trustees making a formal vote? Unless that's what's required.

CHAIR BELL: Trustee Askew.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: Well, I mean, you know, again, conversations. You do have to be cautious about some of these conversations. Because I'm going to tell you right now when you go to some of these members at the Council and you mention you want to go through -- you
want housing and you got financial enrollment
problems, you're going to get a negative
reaction. I already know three right not who
are going to blow that -- who are going to
exacerbate that to a level.

And right now, given at least from
the legislative side, I mean we don't have a
lot of friends. All right. Nobody's running
to protect us.

All I'm saying is, you know,
again, you know, to Chris's point, I just
think you just got to -- I'm not -- we're not
saying -- I'm not even saying not to do that.
What I'm saying is that we have to be very
clear on what's the basis and why we're coming
in and what we said. Because if it is
interpreted or if it's communicated in a
different way, it's going to create -- it
could potentially create some, you know,
public attention that we really don't need.

Because the reality of the matter
is that, you know, we have a Master Plan as
you said that's been approved. You have
presented kind of what you thought the process
should be as we, you know, go about our Master
Plan. You know, I am feeling, you know, a
little bit more comfortable now and
particularly about the discussion about the
potential idea of a solicitation though I
would want to know what the cost associated
with that is and whether or not it's pulling
from something else that is of value for the
University and again, I don't know what the
number would be at all. I mean I don't know
what the range would be. So, I can't even
begin to guess what that would be.

So, I mean -- in the State
Department, I mean again I'm with, you know,
Chairman Bell on this. I don't know -- and
particularly talking to that stakeholder
because it's not like they're going to -- I
don't know that they will jump out. We
haven't seen them just jump out and just start
talking about a conversation that we've had
with them about various things in the past. So, I don't necessarily --

MS. JUMPER: They've had some discussions with us.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: Right. Typically, right, it is -- I thought that that was a discussion that's usually a little bit more contained than it would be once you start having conversations with public officials and particularly at a time when some of them are running and what they will try to do to gain some points.

So, for me, you know, if it's just okay, you know, is it all right to go out for solicitation, for me, okay, I'm open to that. We want to know what the numbers are. You know, if it's about talking to people, again, I just think you just got to be very clear and I don't know how you structure that to make sure that you're very clear.

I'm supportive of that and I think most of the Committee Members are supportive
of that and I think from what you said that
gives at least a little bit more guidance
because you didn't know whether or not the
solicitation was okay.

MS. JUMPER: Yes, this does help.

This is a very helpful discussion. So, I do
-- I will table my concerns.

I think I've heard that the
consensus is that I have authority to proceed
with the solicitation with an understanding
that we're seeking a developer partnership.
The costs associated with it if it meets the
threshold would come back before this
Committee anyway. If not, I will certainly
make sure our Chair's mindful of the cost
associated with it. Most likely will be out
of capital that it would be funded.

I have no idea what that dollar
value is. I have no idea. I'm looking at --
anybody have any idea? But, we will certainly
let you know as we proceed.

As it relates to engaging
stakeholders, that will be some time down the road. We don't have to do that immediately because we would take our partner to those meetings.

So, that would be probably realistically a nine-month period probably by the time we do the solicitation and make a selection and have somebody on board.

Sherry, I'm looking at you.

But, I think that's a safe range to work within before we actually have a dialogue with stakeholders downtown with details.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: Yes, but before you do the solicitation, you'll come back to the Committee so we'll know what it's going to cost -- what it's going to cost to put out the RFP of the solicitation. Right?

MS. JUMPER: If that's your request. I mean I thought only if it's a million dollars.

CHAIR BELL: Yes, I mean if it
exceeds -- I mean this is a business activity.
Right. Unless it exceeds -- I don't want us
to be --

MS. JUMPER: Yes. We don't
normally do that.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: I don't know what
the number is.

CHAIR BELL: Yes.

MS. JUMPER: If it will be -- if
it's a million dollars --

CHAIR BELL: You got to come back.

MS. JUMPER: -- we would -- well,
it's $4 million technically because of the
capital -- use of capital dollars we would
come back. If anything under that, we
technically do not have that requirement to
come back before the Board.

If you're asking that we do in
this instance, I think we could make a
exception obviously.

I don't know if that's what you're
asking, but the threshold suggests it would
have to be over $4 million.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: Well, again, I'd like to know what that number is. I'm not actually looking for a -- I'm not looking for necessarily approval.

MS. JUMPER: We can provide that. Um-hum. Sure. I understand.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: But, I am looking to at least be able to say -- to know what that number -- what the number is.

MS. JUMPER: That's fair.

PRESIDENT LYONS: We could let you know. We could let you know what the amount is. The amount, you know --

MS. JUMPER: Yes, I understand. We could certainly. Definitely. No problem.

TRUSTEE SHELTON: And again, as a Committee as we meet, information sessions.

MS. JUMPER: Absolutely.

TRUSTEE SHELTON: Information to the Board. This -- you know, we look at a color scheme. I mean, you know, I have no
idea professionally what's entitled, but we've
done this on the project.

MS. JUMPER: Okay.

TRUSTEE SHELTON: We belong this
way.

PRESIDENT LYONS: As long as we're
not sitting at a Board meeting debating color
schemes.

TRUSTEE SHELTON: You know, I
don't expect to do that. I just --

PRESIDENT LYONS: Then we're all
in trouble.

CHAIR BELL: No, I mean and that's
one of the things that, you know, I am mindful
of. I don't want the Board to be accused of
micromanaging.

So, and the other thing that I
want to make clear and hopefully that's coming
through, although the University's in a
difficult time right now, we cannot stop
thinking about the future and where we want to
be and how we're going to get ourselves there
and I think that housing will help us to get there.

So, I don't want us to be so concerned and preoccupied with what's going on in the present that we can't anticipate and think about things in the future. So, that's why I support the housing. So, and I think it's good.

PRESIDENT LYONS: And we'll let you know what this -- what's the cost. Yes.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: And where the money's coming from. So --

PRESIDENT LYONS: Yes.

MS. JUMPER: Yes. Absolutely.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: Okay.

MS. JUMPER: Well, I think -- but, it was not too clear.

The other issue is, of course, 801 North Capitol Street and just to very quickly summarized without spending most of the time on it, we did respond to 801 in some fashion through the Strategic Plan in terms of some
recommendations for consideration.

One of the recent questions we had from a not-to-be-named trustee is what is the status of 801? We had a trustee -- one of the Trustees asked the question of me to respond to the status of 801 North Capitol and I'm not sure how to respond to that.

I'll say that there were several recommendations made. One was, in fact -- well, there are several factions. One, move some faction of the community college to Backus to free up space. One was to backfill some of that space with incubator businesses. There was discussion, but not actual recommendation to move everyone back to the campus here. One, time prohibitive. Cost prohibitive perhaps in the short term.

So, not that it wasn't thought about. It's just as we calculate it will be at a minimum $11 million dollar venture.

There is so many moving parts to doing that. I guess we would like to have at
some point to answer that question maybe some more dialogue. Maybe not tonight. But, how we proceed with that discussion. But --

PRESIDENT LYONS: Time to --

MS. JUMPER: No. No, Dr. Lyons.

Not at all. But, that was my reason for putting this on the agenda. Not to certainly take that away from Dr. Lyons.

I'm sorry, Dr. Lyons.

PRESIDENT LYONS: No, I'm glad you put it on the agenda because there's another wrinkle to this.

At the last meeting, we were -- when we had the discussion about athletics and we were directed to find $4 million. In the event that athletics is not eliminated, how would we fill that finance gap and in order to do that, we developed some options.

We used the work that Facilities had done and shared a draft with the Chair.

I shared a draft with the Chair just to say here's what our thinking is. Here's where
we're heading and the question came up about
the fact that we concluded that 801 would not
be a part of the $4 million backfill because
of the time that it would take to address that
and in my conversation with the Chair, you
know, we --

CHAIR BELL: You mean like --

PRESIDENT LYONS: Yes.

CHAIR BELL: Okay.

PRESIDENT LYONS: I'm sorry.

CHAIR BELL: I was thinking the
chair --

PRESIDENT LYONS: No. No. No.

I'm sorry. I apologize.

CHAIR BELL: Okay. You mean the
real Chair.

PRESIDENT LYONS: In my
conversation with --

CHAIR BELL: Okay.

PRESIDENT LYONS: -- with Dr.

Crider --

CHAIR BELL: The important chair.
Okay.

PRESIDENT LYONS: The question came up well, you know, we've never really decided and it's another one of these questions, you know, we keep talking about 801 and so, when we concluded that that probably would not be an item in the $4 million backfill and we said well, there are reasons for that.

First of all, the Board has never formally decided that we ought to move the community college back to Van Ness. Okay. That's the first thing.

CHAIR BELL: Um-hum.

PRESIDENT LYONS: Secondly, if the Board votes and decides to move the community college back to Van Ness, we would need to do a number of things.

One, we would need to talk to the U.S. Department of Education and probably ask them to waive their policy that a branch is geographically separate. Okay. Because
that's the definition now of a branch. That
it's geographically separate. So --

TRUSTEE ASKEW: Now, let me just
before you get past that point, we've asked
that question before.

PRESIDENT LYONS: Okay.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: And asked your
predecessor.

PRESIDENT LYONS: Okay.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: Said when he
asked, the answer was -- is that it would be
okay. Because he's the one that presented the
first right sizing and it was presented. The
Board did make a -- the Board did -- the first
exercise.

PRESIDENT LYONS: The Board voted
to move it.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: The Board -- it
was included in the --

CHAIR BELL: Right-sizing plan.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: -- plan. The

right-sizing plan.
PRESIDENT LYONS: Okay.

CHAIR BELL: The question was asked and also, I don't know if it was asked of the --

TRUSTEE ASKEW: And he did ask and he said -- and they said he asked specifically if we were to move it to back right here as long as it was in a separate building like we -- and this --

CHAIR BELL: Could have it's own postal address.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: Yes. He said -- what the Board was told that they said that that would be fine.

CHAIR BELL: And we also asked Middle States about -- well, we asked Middle States about it and then the consultants that we had from Dow Lohmes who were formerly of Middle States had also thought that the geographical requirement was met if it was an isolated building capable of having it's own postal address.
So, I don't know if they went to the Department of Education.

PRESIDENT LYONS: Well, I appreciate the feedback because the thing that made me conclude that we needed to go to the USDE was because when I talked to the folk at Middle States --

CHAIR BELL: Yes.

PRESIDENT LYONS: -- they said well, we would have to get the USDE to waive in a sense that requirement. So, my assumption is that if it had already been -- the request had already been made, Middle States would have known something about it and we wouldn't have it.

So, that's why --

TRUSTEE ASKEW: And just let me because I'm not clear on --

PRESIDENT LYONS: Yes.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: -- whether he asked Middle States or the U.S. Department of Education.
PRESIDENT LYONS: Okay.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: But, I know he went to one and again, I mean, you know, the people have changed over at Middle States as well.

PRESIDENT LYONS: Sure. Sure.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: So, he may have went to Middle States and gotten an answer, but now, as you know, the people have changed and their strategies and the way they look at institutions have changed as well.

PRESIDENT LYONS: Okay.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: So.

PRESIDENT LYONS: So, for the sake of discussion then, there would have to be that approval. U.S. Department of Ed would have to agree then that if we moved here, moved into our own building, had a separate mailing address, et cetera, et cetera that they would be comfortable with that and that we would not loose the branch status.

I indicated to Dr. Crider we'd
also have to deal with the numbers. So, this 
Vice President has projected that it could 
cost as much as $11 million to move the 
community college back, to renovate space for 
them, to renovate space for the people you'd 
have to move out of building 44 into their new 
location, et cetera, et cetera. So, we had to 
cost that out and identify where that money 
would come from.

Then we would have to deal with 
the City in terms of -- well, we'd have to 
deal with the owner of the building. I'm 
sorry. We'd have to deal with the owner of 
the building because right now we're the 
tenant and if we move out, we're still 
obligated to pay the rent.

So, there would have to be some 
agreement with the owner of the building to 
allow us to move, to find somebody else to 
come in and lease the space and/or we would 
have to go to the City and see if they would 
move another state agency into the building
freeing us from the lease, et cetera, et cetera.

So, that is why we didn't feel that this would be timely enough to be a part of the backfill for the 4 million that -- you know, I won't call the trustee's name either who said you all can surely find 4 million in your budget, you know, and we're looking, but that isn't one of the options because that could take who knows how many years and we don't control it.

So, and the dollars that we need to move the Strategic Plan forward, we need to identify sooner than later so that we can pump them into a program that you heard about earlier. The kinds of things that we wanted to do. So, I did not --

CHAIR BELL: Well, of those three, the one that concerns me the most is the cost. Because the Department of Education is dealing with HBCUs that are struggling and they're trying to do it.
So, I mean it seems like to me if we were to talk with them and explain to them the financial situation of the University and how this can help to facilitate and articulate a pathway where those community college students could then go to the four-year university or would perhaps be more likely and that we'd have shared cost that would be reduced as a result of that.

I think -- I don't know what's in the waiver process, but I would think that there's a lot of factors that align for us that would help us out and I don't know that this is the first request. There are others that are doing it. So, that one hopefully we'd be able to address.

With respect to the lease, I mean the landlord can only go by what's in the lease and we have the right to assign it to another agency. We'd have to find that agency, but we have the right to assign it to an agency and then if it's a non-agency --
but, it's reasonable approval. So, they -- I mean they can't be arbitrary or capricious. They can't condition it. It's a reasonable approval.

And then if it's a non-government agency, I think -- actually, I think it's for a non-agency they have approval. Right? I think if it's another government agency, I thought we could do it.

Now, that doesn't mean we can produce a government agency. You know, you could try to assign and sublet as well.

So, I think that there's options with respect to the lease.

Finding $11 million, you know, that's the harder one. I mean we have what? Seventeen years left on that lease, you know.

And when this was first talked about, it was about $8 million in savings. It was the 5 million from 801. Then it was P.R. Harris and then it was Backus and it wasn't leaving the wards where we were at with those...
locations, but moving into more efficient locations because P.R. Harris was such a drain on us.

So, there was a lot to be talked about, but ideally, cost savings from those could help offset that $11 million.

So, I mean I think that there's options for all of these, but it's not going to be easy and you're right. There was no vote that was ever taken because we were never asked to do a vote on it. We were raising ideas when we first put out the right-sizing plan.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: Right-sizing plan.

Um-hum. Okay. Because the cost to stay in it is extremely high as well.

CHAIR BELL: Yes.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: So, you can talk about the savings, but if it's 17 more years we have --

CHAIR BELL: I thought the 17 years on that one.
MS. JUMPER: It's 17-year lease.

So, two years -- already been a year. So.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: And it's costing

how many a year -- how much a year? Five

million?

MS. JUMPER: It's 5 million

overall.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: Yes.

MS. JUMPER: That's why --

TRUSTEE ASKEW: So, I mean that's

a -- yes, so, I mean but you did preface it by

saying the short term. You did say that.

MS. JUMPER: Pardon me.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: You did say short

term. You said $11 million. It would cost us

$11 million in the short term. That would be

the exact --

MS. JUMPER: That's what we're

projecting, but --

TRUSTEE ASKEW: -- on the short

term, but the long term, you know, by staying

in it, I mean that's --
CHAIR BELL: You'd spend far more.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: -- it's an expense and does it escalate any more than what it is today?

MS. JUMPER: Yes.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: So, then it gets -- so, then it gets -- it gets higher than that. Yes.

CHAIR BELL: So, Jim, were you looking for just -- were you raising the issue or do you -- is this something that you think we need to talk about more in the Executive Committee or something like that?

PRESIDENT LYONS: Well, I think that, you know, this keeps coming up, you know, in all of our meetings. I mean it keeps coming up 801. Move 801 back. Move 801 back and I didn't know that the Board had ever taken action to do that and certainly, if you're going to start down that path, we would need, in fact, the authority and direction from the Board.
This is what we want to do and
this has nothing to do with the politics. We
haven't even -- I hadn't even gotten into
that. I'm not even talking about the
politics.

CHAIR BELL: You notice I left
that out.

PRESIDENT LYONS: Right. Well,
we're not there yet because there's enough --
there's enough on the table, you know, to try
to make that happen.

Because I'm not sure how DOE would
respond to that only because you're asking --
if, in fact, they have established the
definition for branches, you know, even if
they were emotionally supportive whether they
would want to open that door up to waiving
that definition and saying well, you know, a
branch can be in the same building with you.
You know, it doesn't matter. You know, I mean
whether they want to -- whether they would
want to be --
CHAIR BELL: They don't even have
to be emotional about it. I mean literally --

PRESIDENT LYONS: I said emotional. Desiring to help us, but --

CHAIR BELL: I mean --

PRESIDENT LYONS: Whether they'd
want to open that up, I'm not sure, you know,
but before going to the --

CHAIR BELL: Yes.

PRESIDENT LYONS: But, I will
research to see if, in fact, that request was
made. But, I know if it was made, people have
changed in Middle States. You're absolutely
right. But, they appear not to be aware of
the fact that that's --

CHAIR BELL: Nothing has gone to
the Department of Education.

TRUSTEE FELTON: If there were a
request that would be in writing. The records
will reflect that.

So, I mean I don't think we have
to spend a lot of time. If there's no record,
it didn't happen.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: And I do want to make sure I'm clear. You know, the 801 -- I actually like the location of 801. You know, I have other concerns about this capacity issue. I like the location. So, really I like all that.

To me at the end of the day, it's all about the expense associated with it. Has nothing to do with the location, whether I like the building.

You know, if you ask me about P.R. Harris, I got a different opinion about that. Right. Because I do believe that there's probably some other space that would be better than what we have today.

MS. JUMPER: More conducive to our needs.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: Right. More conducive to our needs.

So, that's, you know, it is and, you know, P.R. Harris still has an expense
element plus it just had facilities completely
just -- so, I'm not against 801 North Capitol
Street.

I am just -- I continue to be very
concerned as to the expenses associated with
it and whether or not it is something at least
in the current -- where we are today where
there's something that we can continue to bear
unless we also have some strategies. Okay.

We also need -- if we're going to
keep it, then I think we got to look beyond --
we got to look at figuring out well, how are
we going to -- how are we going to bear that
burden because it does continue to escalate
and so, we need to figure out how we're going
to do that. So that, you know, whether that
means we're still -- there's still an
opportunity to lease some space. I don't know
what it may look like, but I do think that
we've got to find some help in subsidizing the
cost of that location.

CHAIR BELL: So, then, why don't
we convene a meeting of you, Dr. Lyons and you Barbara and the real chair and myself and maybe we can talk about some different options and then get something ready for the Board to think about. Because, you know --

PRESIDENT LYONS: Facilities has developed those options.

CHAIR BELL: Yes, but I think we need a discussion.

PRESIDENT LYONS: Sure.

CHAIR BELL: Yes. Yes. So, in order to move this on because you keep saying it's popping up, you don't have direction and so, the Board is going to have to give you the direction.

The Board never voted on moving out of 801 because it was suggested in the right-sizing plan and then that provoked a reaction and then when we did our 20/20 Vision Plan, it was referenced in there. But, the discussion wasn't there about it and so, that's why I think there's this gap because
there was never any -- there was never a request to act upon what was in the right-sizing plan because that was thrown out there. So, I think it is fair to say that there should be some type of action or some type of statement from the Board to address this.

So, but I think the way to do that is to get the Committees Members, Executive Committee and you and Barbara together, talk about it some more and then figure out what we want to do and get something to the Board and it'll need to come to the Facilities I think first.

Okay. Does that make sense?

PRESIDENT LYONS: Yes. Thank you.

CHAIR BELL: All right. Any other construction planning facility business under that topic?

Thank you.

MS. JUMPER: I think we go to buses now.

CHAIR BELL: Okay. So, Trustee
Askew, we had changed the agenda a little bit. So, I think what we can do now is go back to the Motor Coach Buses' contract. Talk about that. All right.

MS. JUMPER: Oh, I was corrected. There are two items that we will bring before you in the --

CHAIR BELL: Okay.

MS. JUMPER: Two items for consideration. I'm sorry. Thank you. Two items for contract consideration would be presented. One will be the -- oh, gosh, I lost it real quick. Contract for the -- Engineering Program contract will come before you and the other one is Backus. That's right. The next phase of Backus. So, those are two contracts that'll be coming and we'll be seeking your approval for March.

CHAIR BELL: Okay.

MS. JUMPER: So, just giving you a heads up on that.
CHAIR BELL: Okay.

MS. JUMPER: Motor Coaches.

Before you a request to consider approval for two buses for the University's use. We have historically had two buses in the fleet for the University. They are probably 25 and 28 -- 25 and 30 years respectively in their age.

We have attempted to -- yes, they are very old. They definitely have out used -- I mean outlived their usefulness. Their life cycle has been exceeded many times over by trying to get it refurbished. They've been towed down to Lorton, Virginia on numerous occasions. The buses have actually literally broken down en route on transit on the interstate with students on board on numerous occasions and we'd have to call another bus to rescue our students.

With that said, this issue has been long standing. We actually got to a place last spring where my staff brought to me a request for purchasing new buses long before
the right sizing and I'll say that for a reason.

The need for reliable bus service existed then and now and we do believe it's more cost effective to move forward and to get students a more reliable method for transit.

So, we have gone out and sought solicitation for two buses as we have two now. The primary users of our buses vary. One obvious user -- predominant user is athletics. However, we do have 4H. We have our student government association causes and I have a list here somewhere. Kind of got off on 801, but we have numerous program utility for the bus that goes beyond athletics and I say because I will assume that some of the questions will come with the thinking that this is done or being purchased to support athletic activities only. I will say they are the predominant user.

The reason why two buses are needed is that there -- if athletics remains
which as far as I know right now, they will, there are instances where two buses are transit at the same time as we have multiple teams.

But, there are also times when athletics may be using it and Workforce Development, for example, had necessity for use of our buses. PASS has use for our buses. Faculty and staff retreats. So, we have numerous or various opportunities to use our buses.

It's still opportunities to maybe lease out our buses for revenue generating purposes.

But, the bigger factor I think is one, the buses are aged. We lose an opportunity to advertise the University when we use rental buses which we're doing right now because those buses are basically with no utility.

We will sell those buses. So, we will get some revenue from that.
But, we advertise. We get a beautiful bus. University of the District of Columbia. Not only in the City. It goes on the transit of 95 and any other place we have to go. A lot of times going North 95 because we're in the conference that goes up to Connecticut and New York. It's a great advertisement tool.

With that said, I put before the Committee the request for consideration of approval for two buses for the University.

CHAIR BELL: All right. Thank you. I'm just going to open this up. So, if anybody wants to ask any questions, feel free.

Trustee Felton.

TRUSTEE FELTON: Yes, I have a question. Life cycle, I mean I understand we have far exceeded that, but I suppose each year it came before us we simply didn't have the money or what? And tell us what we spend on rental versus purchase. I mean.

MS. JUMPER: We're going to call
Cassandra Park up who's over transportation.

I'll be candid with you. For the
last five years, I've been pushing this
discussion back as a priority. We're just at
a point now where buses have broken down so
many times it's embarrassing to see a UDC bus
on I-95 with students waiting for someone to
come rescue them.

So, this is an issue of just
really outliving it's usefulness. We're
leasing now. That has been candidly
problematic with the last vendor that we had.

We have a new one now who's far
more reliable, but candidly, I'm not sure if
that's how the University will want to
proceed.

But, I'll allow her to speak to
the cost.

MS. PARK: Hi. Cassandra Park.

So, far last year, we know that we spent about
$100,000 in renting the buses.

TRUSTEE FELTON: One year.
MS. PARK: One year. Yes.

CHAIR BELL: So, Barbara --

MS. JUMPER: Thank you, Cassandra.

CHAIR BELL: -- where is the money coming from for the buses? Is it out of the capital budget?

MS. JUMPER: Yes, so, we made a special request to the Office of Budget to be able to use our capital for the purpose of purchasing the bus. They gave us the authority to do that.

So, we are using capital Paygo money which will allow us to make this purchase.

CHAIR BELL: And if it's not used, we lost it. Right?

MS. JUMPER: Not really. It'll be used for another --

CHAIR BELL: It has to be reallocated to another --

MS. JUMPER: It will be reallocated for another use. Yes.
TRUSTEE SHELTON: That was my question. I'm glad. I was concerned that we were getting a four-bus fleet and I was trying to explain to myself why we would have a four-bus fleet.

MS. JUMPER: Four buses?

TRUSTEE SHELTON: Yes.

MS. JUMPER: Oh, no.

TRUSTEE SHELTON: Two that we already had and --

MS. JUMPER: Oh, no. No, we're going to dispose by way of getting revenue back for the sale of those because that's salvageable parts for somebody. Somebody -- a nice church might like the bus. Try to fix it, but they are --

TRUSTEE FELTON: Will you talk about the maintenance and the drivers and operations?

MS. JUMPER: So, yes, the maintenance of the buses right now -- and I'm going to step out on this one, but I believe
we will continue to have a maintenance. It will be under warranty for some period of time.

Sherry, can you speak to the warranty?

MS. QUASHIE: That's correct.

That's correct.

MS. JUMPER: Okay. So, five-year warranty. So, most of the service for the bus at least for the first five years will be covered under warranty.

We will still hire by way of a contract someone to actually drive the bus. We are kind of trying to determine whether or not it's cost effective to hire a full-time bus driver to sit and wait for -- to be engaged. I think it's cheaper to actually hire someone, but we'll see.

Two new buses, maybe the activity will increase. Maybe it will justify the need of hiring a full-time bus driver, but right now, our thinking is to continue on the track.
of hiring a CDL bus driver to come in and
actually transport our students.

One, they're certified. The
liability is with the company. It's not with
the University.

TRUSTEE SHELTON: Because the
insurance for groups for athletics is very
high. So --

MS. JUMPER: That's correct.

TRUSTEE SHELTON: -- one of the
things I heard you say was that it's going to
be carried by the carrier.

MS. JUMPER: That's correct.

TRUSTEE SHELTON: Okay. Not by
the University because that was another
concern.

MS. JUMPER: I'm sorry. Sherry,
is there something I'm saying incorrectly?
Did I say something?

Yes, the buses, but the drivers
are also insured by virtue of their company.

TRUSTEE SHELTON: But, the riders
of the buses, who's covering that insurance?

MS. QUASHIE: That would cover --

that would be covered by the University.

MS. JUMPER: Sherry. Sherry.

TRUSTEE SHELTON: That's -- okay.

That's -- is that expense included in the

pricing?

MS. QUASHIE: Good evening.

Sherry Quashie. Good evening. Sherry

Quashie.

That cost would be covered -- that

cost, that would cover the students. The

insurance that we use to cover the buses would

cover the students.

TRUSTEE SHELTON: Okay. Excuse

me. In the past, there was a school insurance

that we have on all of our students. Do we

still have that? You know, does every college

student have to have insurance?

I'm talking from my public school.

MS. QUASHIE: Yes, I --

TRUSTEE SHELTON: Please don't
misunderstand. Is that -- we will give you an
insurance policy. All of our athletics had to
have an insurance policy that they were able
to purchase as a group purchase.

MS. QUASHIE: Was it for health
insurance or was it --

TRUSTEE SHELTON: Accident
insurance. Not health insurance. Accident
insurance. You know, from door to door is how
we were, you know, explained. So, that when
they got on the bus to go to a game, they were
insured in case something happened.

Now, I'm hearing you say that
expense is picked up by the University.

MS. JUMPER: That's my
understanding.

TRUSTEE SHELTON: But, we do not
require as a University for the students to
have -- you know, when they get on the bus,
they don't -- we don't have a blanket
insurance plan other than what we institute
now?
MS. JUMPER: Yes, I'm not at --
yes, I'm not sure I can respond to that.

MS. QUASHIE: Not to my knowledge.

TRUSTEE SHELTON: I'm just saying
that there's -- it's usually -- there's
usually a transportation insurance package --

MS. JUMPER: Um-hum. That makes
sense.

TRUSTEE SHELTON: -- for carrying
kids or students to events.

MS. JUMPER: That's correct.

TRUSTEE SHELTON: And sometimes
it's carried by the parents and sometimes it's
carried by the organization.

MS. JUMPER: I will step out there
and we have to confirm this. I don't think
anyone can answer that right now, but that
there is a policy that would cover our
students in our University insurance policy.

I'm just not at the point of --

TRUSTEE SHELTON: It's not -- it's
not -- okay and that's just something.
MS. JUMPER: Okay.

CHAIR BELL: I had a question.

MS. JUMPER: Yes.

CHAIR BELL: On the capital procurement summary that you've got on page 1, you indicate on social impact that it would help the University carry out their goals of creating a nurturing and premier community college on here.

MS. JUMPER: Yes.

CHAIR BELL: Can we get the other uses put on here that it will be used for as well?

MS. JUMPER: So, the ones that I spoke to such as the other users? Yes, we can definitely incorporate them.

CHAIR BELL: That's important for folks to know.

MS. JUMPER: I got you.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: Mr. Chairman, I just want to -- yes, I appreciate it because that is what I singled in on and why I want to
be -- make sure I didn't miss this conversation.

MS. JUMPER: Okay.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: Because I wanted to understand the matter. Because if it was just for that particular purpose --

MS. JUMPER: Yes, that would be a problem.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: -- then that creates a whole other level of questioning and concern --

MS. JUMPER: I understand.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: -- for me, but you've gone through it. So, my question --

MS. JUMPER: Okay. So, we will incorporate the other users in the document.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: Other users. Yes, the University, the law school --

MS. JUMPER: Yes, sir.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: Absolutely as needed. So.

MS. JUMPER: Yes.
TRUSTEE ASKEW: Okay.

CHAIR BELL: Are there any other questions?

TRUSTEE FELTON: So moved.

CHAIR BELL: Okay. Motion has been moved --

TRUSTEE SHELTON: Seconded.

CHAIR BELL: -- and seconded.

Okay. All those in favor?

(Ayes.)

CHAIR BELL: Opposed?

Abstentions? Okay. The motion carries unanimously.

All right. So, I believe the next item on our agenda is other business. Is there any other business?

TRUSTEE ASKEW: Mr. Chairman. Mr. Chairman.

CHAIR BELL: Okay.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: No other business.

Well, let me just say this. We did have a conversation as we started our right-sizing
discussions about the University's housing for
the President and I don't think we've had that
on the agenda. But, I do believe it was one
of those areas where, one, it needed further
discussion and then two, because the
discussion would include whether or not it
makes sense to sell it. Whether -- you know
and gain some revenue that way or whether to
keep it.

TRUSTEE FELTON: Although we would
not get the revenue.

MS. JUMPER: That is correct.

TRUSTEE FELTON: Right.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: Right. We would
not. Right. Well, that's true.

MS. JUMPER: We would have to seek
approval from the City to retain the use of
those dollars.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: Right. Okay.

So --

MS. JUMPER: And they may or may
not do that.
TRUSTEE ASKEW: -- I only bring it up just to keep the conversation going because I know we say we were going to get back to -- and then as we look for our permanent president, that issue will need to -- will resurface and so, I just want to make sure this Committee is taking a look at it.

CHAIR BELL: No, I appreciate that. I don't know that we talked about it at the last meeting or not. I mean we are aware of the fact that the money would go back to the City unless we get a waiver.

The other issue, of course, is finding housing that's within the two-mile curtilage of the University so they could qualify for the tax -- the favorable tax treatment for the president. So, you know, we've talked about is there some type of flop or exchange or something that we could theoretically do if we could find something in the price range for the University, but that's something that I guess we'll need to follow up.
on.

MS. JUMPER: I'll be very candid. We have not had the time to, but we will devote some time to explore on whether or not there's a property within the radius that's within the IRS guidelines that could possibly work.

TRUSTEE FELTON: Or an exchange.

MS. JUMPER: Yes.

TRUSTEE FELTON: Yes, that would be the --

TRUSTEE ASKEW: Yes, especially on a -- yes, but I -- yes.

PRESIDENT LYONS: Or you -- have you already decided that you want to stay in the presidential housing business?

MS. JUMPER: Business.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: No. No. No, that's not -- and I think that's the conversation. I don't think -- we haven't had that full conversation.

MS. JUMPER: No, we haven't.
TRUSTEE ASKEW: Because there are
-- even though, you know, we do have expense
associated with it now and then we have
limited utility out of it. So.

TRUSTEE FELTON: And a housing
allowance would probably be cheaper.

TRUSTEE ASKEW: Yes, and again,
I'd like to explore, you know, yes, a
conversation on all those issues.

TRUSTEE SHELTON: And this is an
agenda item, as a follow up, you know we have
a full year of parking money.

MS. JUMPER: Yes.

TRUSTEE SHELTON: And that was my
question before. Is that -- we have some
experience now with parking. So, we could do
some -- I never did find out how much income
we generated and again, I'm just asking us to
start presenting that such that we're aware of
the benefits of all renovations to parking.

MS. JUMPER: Sure.

TRUSTEE SHELTON: In the past, we
could never tell how much revenue was
generated from parking. Now, we can, but to
date, there's been no information I'm aware of
as to what --

MS. JUMPER: Presented to you.

TRUSTEE SHELTON: -- has -- what
the zero-base budget was. You know, we've got
the first year. I presume it will go up. I
presume it will grow, but the first year gives
us something we never had before as to what
that income looks like on an annual basis and
that was --

CHAIR BELL: Do you have any ball
park on that?

MS. JUMPER: I have requested from
finance. They're in the midst of closing and
I will have some final I didn't have in time
for this meeting today.

TRUSTEE SHELTON: I just wanted to
keep it on the table.

MS. JUMPER: I know you requested
if, but yes, I will definitely have it to you.
TRUSTEE SHELTON: And I've said that before. Okay.

CHAIR BELL: Okay. I'd like to know about the student center.

MS. JUMPER: Yes.

CHAIR BELL: How are we doing?

MS. JUMPER: That's a great question. The student center, we do now have approval from the City Council and for whatever reason, new practice or new policy, the Mayor had to sign off on it.

I'll just say there was some delay in getting everything done, but we now have been told officially that the 20 percent's approved and we are moving forward.

I'll look to my team if they want to add anything, but you will see vigorous movement if we can get it above freezing.

We finally have everything we need to move this forward. So, you will -- we'll still talking fall -- spring. Come on.

Please my frame is frozen.
TRUSTEE SHELTON: You've been waiting patiently to get --

MR. THOMPSON: Erik Thompson, Office of the Vice President.

We're still aiming at taking occupancy in late -- later part of this year, December, with a ribbon cutting or opening event in the spring of '15.

TRUSTEE SHELTON: Excuse me.

Merry Christmas.

CHAIR BELL: Okay. Does any Trustee have any other questions? No? Barbara or Jim, you got any questions for us?

TRUSTEE SHELTON: You got everybody here now. It's a good time --

MS. JUMPER: No, sir, you all have been very --

CHAIR BELL: Well, you answered yes to everything.

MS. JUMPER: Yes, thank you. No, thank you.

CHAIR BELL: All right. Well, if
there's no other questions, we'll take a
motion for adjournment.

TRUSTEE SHELTON: So moved.

TRUSTEE FELTON: Seconded.

CHAIR BELL: Motion for
adjournment and seconded. Okay. We are
hereby adjourned.

Thank you, everyone, for
participating.

MS. JUMPER: Thank you.

CHAIR BELL: We appreciate it.

(Whereupon, at 7:27 p.m., the
meeting was adjourned.)
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